

1 ARTHUR D. LEVY (SB # 95659)
2 445 Bush Street, 6th Floor
3 San Francisco, California 94108
4 Tel.: (415) 702-4550
5 Fax: (415) 814-4080

6 BRYAN KEMNITZER (SB # 66401)
7 KRISTIN KEMNITZER (SB # 278946)
8 KEMNITZER, BARRON & KRIEG, LLP
9 445 Bush Street, 6th Floor
10 San Francisco, California 94108
11 Tel.: (415) 632-1900
12 Fax: (415) 632-1901

13 NOAH ZINNER (SB # 247581)
14 HOUSING AND ECONOMIC RIGHTS ADVOCATES
15 1814 Franklin Street, Suite 1040
16 Oakland, California 94612
17 Tel.: (510) 271-8443
18 Fax: (510) 868-4251

19 Attorneys for Plaintiff
20 BARBARA VELLINE
21 Individually and on Behalf of
22 All Others Similarly Situated

23 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT

24 NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

25 BARBARA VELLINE, individually and on
26 behalf of All Others Similarly Situated,

27 Case No. CV 14-01916 JD

28 Plaintiff,

PLAINTIFF'S NOTICE OF DECISION BY
NINTH CIRCUIT COURT OF APPEALS
AND REQUEST FOR STATUS
CONFERENCE

vs.

29 JP MORGAN CHASE BANK, N.A., a
30 national association; and DOES 1 through 20,

UNLIMITED JURISDICTION
CLASS ACTION

31 Defendants.

32

33

34

35

36

37

38

39

1 Plaintiff hereby notifies the Court that a Memorandum Opinion was issued by the Ninth
2 Circuit in *Kuns v. Ocwen Loan Servicing, LLC*, No. 13-55562, on May 21, 2015. The Ninth
3 Circuit's Opinion, which has been marked as "NOT FOR PUBLICATION," is attached. Federal
4 Rule of Appellate Procedure 32.1(a) and Ninth Circuit Rule 36-3(b) allow the citation of this
5 Opinion and permit Plaintiff to call it to this Court's attention for the present limited purposes.

6 Plaintiff requests a Status Conference with the Court or, in the alternative, a directive and
7 calendar as to further proceedings in this case.

8 DATED: May 21, 2015

9 /s/ Arthur D. Levy
ARTHUR D. LEVY (SB # 95659)

10 BRYAN KEMNITZER (SB # 66401)
11 KRISTIN KEMNITZER (SB # 278946)
KEMNITZER, BARRON & KRIEG, LLP

12 NOAH ZINNER (SB # 247581)
13 HOUSING AND ECONOMIC RIGHTS ADVOCATES

14 Attorneys for Plaintiff
15 BARBARA VELLINE
16 Individually and on Behalf of
17 All Others Similarly Situated

18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28

FILED

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

MAY 21 2015

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

JEFFREY KUNS, an individual, on his
own behalf and on behalf of all others
similarly situated,

Plaintiff - Appellant,

v.

OCWEN LOAN SERVICING, LLC, a
Delaware limited liability company,

Defendant - Appellee.

No. 13-55562

D.C. No. 2:12-cv-07118-DMG-
PLA

MEMORANDUM*

Appeal from the United States District Court
for the Central District of California
Dolly M. Gee, District Judge, Presiding

Argued and Submitted April 10, 2015
Pasadena, California

Before: SILVERMAN and BEA, Circuit Judges and QUIST, ** Senior District
Judge.

Plaintiff Jeffrey Kuns appeals the district court's dismissal with prejudice of
his putative class action complaint against Defendant Ocwen Loan Servicing, LLC.

* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent
except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

** The Honorable Gordon J. Quist, Senior District Judge for the U.S.
District Court for the Western District of Michigan, sitting by designation.

We have jurisdiction under 28 U.S.C. § 1291, and we review the district court's decision *de novo*, construing the facts alleged in the complaint in the light most favorable to the plaintiff. *Schlegel v. Wells Fargo Bank, NA*, 720 F.3d 1204, 1207 (9th Cir. 2013). We affirm in part and reverse in part the district court's decision.

Kuns alleges that because his former home was bought with a purchase money mortgage and sold through a nonjudicial foreclosure, he had no personal liability for the deficiency that resulted from the foreclosure sale. Cal. Code Civ. Proc. §§ 580b, 580d. Ocwen was nonetheless reporting the deficiency amount to credit reporting agencies such as Equifax. After Kuns filed for bankruptcy, Ocwen reported that the deficiency was discharged via the bankruptcy. Kuns alleges that Ocwen's reporting of the deficiency, without being accompanied by additional information to indicate Kuns' lack of personal liability, violated Ocwen's obligation under California's Consumer Credit Reporting Agencies Act ("CCRAA") to not report information that Ocwen "knows or should know . . . is incomplete or inaccurate." Cal. Civ. Code § 1785.25(a). The district court concluded that Ocwen had no "affirmative duty" under the CCRAA to indicate that the deficiency could not be collected from Kuns, and dismissed the complaint.

The CCRAA does not define what constitutes "incomplete or inaccurate" reporting. Nevertheless, in interpreting the Fair Credit Reporting Act (the

-3-

CCRAA's federal analogue) and other provisions of the CCRAA, we have held that "an item on a credit report can be 'incomplete or inaccurate' . . . because it is misleading in such a way and to such an extent that it can be expected to adversely affect credit decisions.'" *Carvalho v. Equifax Info. Servs.*, 629 F.3d 876, 890 (9th Cir. 2010) (quoting *Gorman v. Wolpoff & Abramson, LLP*, 584 F.3d 1147, 1163 (9th Cir. 2009)). In general, "similar terms appearing in different sections of a statute should receive the same interpretation," and this court also "operate[s] under the assumption that California courts would interpret the FCRA and CCRAA consistently." *Carvalho*, 629 F.3d at 890. On this basis, we interpret the phrase "incomplete or inaccurate" in CCRAA § 1785.25(a) as requiring that furnishers of credit information such as Ocwen not only refrain from making any reports that are obviously wrong or missing crucial data, but also that the reports not contain information that is materially misleading.

In light of this discussion, Kuns's allegation that Ocwen's reporting was "incomplete or inaccurate" regarding his personal liability for the foreclosure deficiency stated a claim under CCRAA § 1785.25. We note that unlike the company in *Wang v. Asset Acceptance, LLC*, which faced only the potential of the debtor raising a statute of limitations defense, Ocwen itself had made an election of remedies when it sold Kuns's home in a non-judicial foreclosure, thereby changing

-4-

the collectibility of the debt. 681 F. Supp. 2d 1143 (N.D. Cal. 2010). The anti-deficiency laws’ protection against post-foreclosure personal liability is complete and nonwaivable, in contrast to the affirmative defense of the statute of limitations that the debtor in *Wang* could raise. *See DeBerard Props. v. Lim*, 976 P.2d 843 (Cal. 1999) (holding that anti-deficiency laws’ protection is nonwaivable). Because Kuns’ complaint stated a claim under CCRAA § 1785.25, the district court should not have granted Ocwen’s motion to dismiss that component of the complaint.

However, the district court correctly concluded that, after Kuns filed for bankruptcy and Ocwen reported the deficiency as discharged in the bankruptcy, this reporting could not have been “incomplete or inaccurate” within the meaning of CCRAA § 1785.25. There is no allegation that Ocwen did anything other than accurately report the action taken by the bankruptcy court. Therefore, we **AFFIRM IN PART, REVERSE IN PART, and REMAND** for proceedings consistent with this Memorandum.

Each party shall bear its own costs.